Tripartite Counterfactual Quantum Cryptography

Hatim Salih[1, *]

[1] *Qubet Research, London NW6 1RE, UK*

(Dated: April 23, 2014)

We show how two distrustful parties, "Bob" and "Charlie", can share a secret key with the help of a mutually trusted "Alice", counterfactually—that is with no information-carrying particles travelling between any of the three parties.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Dd

arXiv:1404.5540v1 [quant-ph] 22 Apr 2014

In a recent paper [1], a quantum cryptography protocol was proposed where an entrusted Alice allows Bob, a bank for example, and Charlie, a client unsure of Bob's identity, to share a secret key that not even Alice has access to. The protocol's aim of extending the original N09 counterfactual quantum key distribution (QKD) protocol [2] to three parties is theoretically and practically interesting. But even though no photons travel all the way between Bob and Charlie, making the protocol counterfactual in one sense, an eavesdropper, Eve, still has full access to Alice's information carrying photons, making the protocol not counterfactual in another crucial sense. This does not in itself make the protocol unsecured, but the powerful promise of security [2] based on the total absence of information-carrying photons from the transmission channels is lost.

Here, we show using a two-cycle chained quantum Zeno effect (CQZE) [3], how Alice can enable Bob and Charlie to share a secret key with no information-carrying photons traveling between any of the three parties—achieving complete counterfactuality. Security arguments [2] and proofs [4] based on complete counterfactuality should thus hold.

The overall action of the two-cycle CQZE, whose inner working is explained in the caption of FIG. 2, on Alice's horizontally (H) polarised photon is the following, $|\mathrm{H}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathrm{H}\rangle$ when the channel is not blocked, and $|\mathrm{H}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathrm{V}\rangle$ when the channel is blocked. Crucially, in both cases the photon does not travel through the channel. We know this because a photon going into the channel would either trigger detector D_4, for the case of Bob(Charlie) blocking, or else trigger detector D_3 for the case of Bob(Charlie) not blocking. Note that with the smallest possible number of cycles used (two inner and two outer cycles) the probability of the photon not being lost due to detection by D_3 or D_4 is $\approx 1/5$ [5]. (This can be made arbitrarily close to one by increasing the number of cycles, but at the cost of practicality.)

Protocol for tripartite counterfactual quantum cryptography—Alice starts by sending a H photon from the left towards beamsplitter BS of the Michelson interferometer of FIG. 1, which applies a $\pi/2$ rotation to the path qubit, putting the photon in an equal superposition of being on path B (leading to Bob) and path C (leading to Charlie). Bob(Charlie) encodes a "0"("1") by not blocking his channel and encodes a "1"("0") by blocking it. If they encode different bit values, the two parts of the photon superposition reflected back towards Alice's BS (from top and from right) will be, by the action of the two CQZEs, identically polarised. Constructive interference therefore takes place resulting in Alice's D_2 clicking with certainty (provided the photon was not lost to D_3 or D_4). If, however, Bob and Charlie encode the same bit value, the two parts of the photon superposition reflected back towards Alice's BS will be oppositely polarised. Interference does not take place because differing polarisation acts as a which-path "tag". D_1 and D_2 are therefore equally likely to click. Since D_1 clicking corresponds uniquely to Bob and Charlie randomly agreeing on their bit value, whenever D_1 clicks Alice publicly instructs Bob and Charlie to keep the corresponding bits as their sifted key, the rest are discarded. Throughout, no information-carrying photons have traversed either channel.

In summary, using a two-cycle chained quantum Zeno effect, we have shown how to achieve completely counterfactual QKD between two distrustful parties assisted by another entrusted party—with no information-carrying particles travelling between any of them.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is partially supported by Qubet Research, a start-up in quantum information.

* salih.hatim@gmail.com

[1] Akshata Shenoy H., R. Srikanth, and T. Srinivas, arXiv:1402.2250 (2014)
[2] T.-G. Noh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 230501 (2009).
[3] H. Salih, Z.H. Li, M. Al-Amri, and M.S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 170502 (2013).



FIG. 1. Protocol for tripartite counterfactual quantum cryptography. Bob(Charlie) randomly encodes a "0"("1") by not blocking his channel and a "1"("0") by blocking it. Bob(Charlie) can block his channel by switching Pockels cell $PC_{B(C)}$ on, which flips polarisation, directing the photon towards D_4. Initially, Alice sends a H photon from her photon source S towards beamsplitter BS, which puts the photon in an equal superposition of being on path B (leading to Bob) and path C (leading to Charlie). If Bob and Charlie encode different bit values, the two parts of the photon superposition reflected back towards Alice's BS (from top and from right) will be, by the action of the two CQZEs, identically polarised. Constructive interference therefore takes place resulting in Alice's D_2 clicking with certainty (provided the photon was not lost to D_3 or D_4). If, however, Bob and Charlie encode the same bit value, the two parts of the photon superposition reflected back towards Alice's BS will be oppositely polarised. Interference does not take place. D_1 and D_2 are therefore equally likely to click. A click at D_1 uniquely corresponds to Bob and Charlie randomly agreeing in their bit choices. (Here, OC stands for optical circulator, which directs a photon exiting left towards D_1.)

[4] Z.-Q. Yin, H.-W. Li, W. Chen, Z.-F. Han, and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042335 (2010).

[5] The probability that the photon avoids detection by D_3 for the case of Bob not blocking is given by $\cos^{2M}\theta_M$, where M is the number of outer cycles. For $M = 2$ we get a probability of 1/4. On the other hand, the probability that the photon avoids detection by D_4 for the case of Bob blocking is given by $\prod_{m=1}^{M}(1-\sin^2 m\theta_M \sin^2\theta_N)^N$, where $M(N)$ is the number of outer(inner) cycles. For $M = 2$ and $N = 2$ we get a probability of 9/64. The overall probability of the photon making it back to Alice is therefore 25/128.



FIG. 2. The chained quantum Zeno effect (CQZE). Bob(Charlie) can block the channel by switching Pockels cell PC on, directing the photon towards detector D_4. Initially, switchable mirror SM_1 is switched off allowing Alice's H photon in before being switched on again. Switchable polarisation rotator SPR_1 then applies the following rotation to the photon, $|\mathrm{H}\rangle \rightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{H}\rangle + |\mathrm{V}\rangle)$, before being switched off for the rest of this outer cycle. Polarising beamsplitter PBS_1 reflects the V part of the superposition towards Bob(Charlie). (Optical delays OD ensure that the effective path lengths correctly match.) Switchable mirror SM_2 is then switched off to allow the V part of the superposition into the inner interferometer before being switched on again. Switchable polarisation rotator SPR_2 then applies the following rotation, $|\mathrm{V}\rangle \rightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{V}\rangle - |\mathrm{H}\rangle)$, before being switched off for the rest of this inner cycle. Polarising beamsplitter PBS_2 reflects the V part of the superposition while passing the H part towards Bob(Charlie). There are now two scenarios: (i) If Bob(Charlie) blocks the channel, effectively making a measurement, the part of the photon superposition inside the inner interferometer ends up in the state $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, unless the photon is lost to D_4. The same applies to the next inner cycle. Switchable mirror SM_2 is then switched off to allow this part of the superposition, whose state has remained $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, out. In the next outer cycle, SPR_1 rotates the photon's polarisation from $1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{H}\rangle + |\mathrm{V}\rangle)$ all the way to $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$ before being switched off for the rest of this outer cycle. PBS_1 reflects the photon towards Bob(Charlie). As before, after two inner cycles, the photon remains in the state $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$ unless it is lost to D_4. SM_1 is then switched off to allow the photon, whose final state is now $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, out. (ii) If instead Bob(Charlie) does not block the channel, the part of the photon superposition in the inner interferometer, namely $1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{V}\rangle - |\mathrm{H}\rangle)$, will be rotated all the way to the sate $-|\mathrm{H}\rangle$ after two inner cycles. Switchable mirror SM_2 is then switched off to allow this part of the superposition out. Measurement by D_3 leaves the photon in the overall state $|\mathrm{H}\rangle$ moving towards SM_1, unless it is lost to D_3. The same applies to the next outer cycle (and two inner cycles). SM_1 is then switched off to allow the photon, whose final state is $|\mathrm{H}\rangle$, out. Counterfactuality is ensured as any photon going into the channel would either trigger D_3 for the case of Bob(Charlie) not blocking, or else trigger D_4 for the case of Bob(Charlie) blocking.